



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

a library, and as exported to the shores of the Euxine sea. Now in view of this evidence, recognizing the fragmentary character of the remains we have of the literature of the fifth century before Christ, are we not justified in holding that the use of writing on papyrus for the purpose of preserving and multiplying copies of works of literature began as early as the middle of that century and rapidly grew to be a familiar matter of common life before its end?

It will be observed that I have confined myself to the production of the evidence attainable on my subject with only the necessary explanation of it. My purpose has been simply to bring together all the passages which I could find containing real evidence, in the hope that the collection, not elsewhere made so far as I know, might be of service to any one wishing to ascertain the facts.

IV.—*The Declension of the Definite Article in the Cypriote Inscriptions.**

By ISAAC H. HALL,

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

The riddle of the Cypriote Inscriptions, up to this time, cannot be said to have been completely solved. Not to mention particular knots that occur in sundry inscriptions whose purport is well known, or those places where no final test has given the last word to the discussion, there remain a few inscriptions whose general purport is still a puzzle, some whose characters have not been made out, and some which, though every character is known, refuse to yield any intelligible combinations. Chief of these are (1.) the longest inscription in the Cesnola collection, in part quite plain, but presenting some unique difficulties, though there is scarcely a doubt as to the reading

* In this article the names 1. of the *cases* are abbreviated by their initials in capitals (N. G. D. A.); designations 2. of *number* (s. p.), and 3. of *gender* (m. f. n.), by their initials in small letters.

of any character; (2.) The Naked (or Bearded) Archer inscription of the British Museum, which, in spite of Dr. W. Deecke's attempt published in the *Athenaeum* of May 22, 1880, and thought by him a complete success, is yet a problem to be solved, since his reading depends upon the arbitrary forcing of several characters to read what they demonstrably cannot; (3.) one other important inscription in the British Museum, which is still the subject of discussion, though parts of it are plain; and (4.) a long inscription in the new Cesnola collection, still unread, though it will probably yield to perseverance, and gives promise of solving finally one riddle; with (5.) some minor ones in nearly the same state as the last.

Thus any attempt to construct a grammar or vocabulary of the language, or writing, must still be only tentative, and subject to correction.

The Cypriote syllabary consists of characters representing open syllables only. Of these, five represent the simple vowels, *a, e, i, o, u*, with no distinction between long and short. The others represent a single consonant followed by a vowel; with no distinction between smooth, middle, and rough in the consonants, and no distinction between long and short in the vowels. Thus the same character stands for *κε, γε, χε, κη, γη, χη*. As far as thus discovered, the syllabary is complete for the consonants *k, t, p, l, r, m, s*; that is, it has a character for each of these consonants in combination with each of the five vowels. The *n* series lacks only *nu*; the *z* series lacks *zi, zo, zu*, and the syllable *ze* rests on only one example, and therefore only on probable conjecture. The *y* or *i*-syllables (for the writing has a *yod mobile*, or consonant) lack the *io* and *iu*, perhaps as not required by the language. The digamma or *w*-syllables, lack *wi* and *wu*. Thus, in theory, the syllabary is nearly complete. There is one other character, read by Deecke, Siegismund, and myself as *xe*, because, though thus an anomaly in the system of writing, it appears to have no other Greek equivalent. For what we may call the same reason, Dr. Ahrens reads it as equivalent to a vowel with the Greek *sampi*, or the Hebrew *shin*. According to either view the character is an anomaly in the structure of

the syllabary; and so, for that matter are the *z*-syllables, unless we abandon the idea that the *ζ* was in any sense a double consonant. With the exception of this character for *ze* or *she*, to speak provisionally, the Greek double consonants are represented in the Cypriote writing by two characters.

Since the language, so far as deciphered, is Greek, the analogy of ordinary Greek cannot be disregarded in transliterating Cypriote. Yet in treating Cypriote as a system by itself—a procedure to which it seems fairly entitled—there is obviously much liberty or play allowable in the choice between a long or a short vowel, as well as in the choice between a smooth, a middle, or a rough mute. How far dialectic analogy may or must curb this liberty is a thing obvious enough in many cases, but in other cases quite as obscure. It does not yet appear at what point it is proper to make the choice in the case of the vowels, especially. The transliterator feels that the strictest truth both allows and compels him to adopt the Roman vowel, whose quantity has no visible ear-marks, even at the risk of being thought ignorant of Greek dialects. Moreover, the Cypriote writing has contributed enough in other respects to the knowledge of very ancient Greek peculiarities to justify us in keeping this door open for further light in that particular direction.

As this is not a treatise on the Cypriote epigraphy, it is not necessary to speak at length of the principles of the combination of two characters (or of three, as sometimes happens) into one syllable. These are generally plain enough, and to be understood as a matter of course. It may be mentioned, however, that a word, especially an elided proclitic, has sometimes its end in the middle of a character, so to speak. Also, the *n*, or Greek *ν*, is often not written, and has to be understood. Whether it was pronounced or not in the spoken language, or whether it had passed into an unwritten nasal, or whatever else had become of it, it is not to our purpose here to inquire. The writing never doubles a consonant. *Iota* adscript, answering to *iota* subscript in Greek, is sometimes written and sometimes not. The *e* vowel is often replaced by the *i* vowel. When a word ends in a consonant,

its final syllable, unless serving also for the opening syllable of the following word, regularly ends in a character having the *e* vowel. Of course no breathings occur.

Another element perhaps to be taken into account in transliterating, is the apparent versification of some of the inscriptions. This has been assumed and practically insisted on to an extravagant extent by a late writer, Richard Neubauer, in one of the *Commentationes Philologicae in Honorem Theodori Mommseni*, Berlin, 1877; but as each writer is apt to assume his own system of versification, and construct his syllables accordingly, this element has been of no service. From its nature it can scarcely be a guide, except in determining a doubtful place when other considerations determine all the surroundings; and even then this method is chargeable with imposing foreign laws where truth requires only the statement of those which certainly exist. There is nothing in the rest of Neubauer's matter of a grade high enough to warrant our following his fancy in this respect.

In the following, only those conclusions will be stated concerning which there remains no reasonable doubt. Yet in every case the possibility of modification in a future light must be allowed.

In gathering up the facts respecting the declension of the definite article in the Cypriote writing, it will be more convenient to take each inscription by itself. The first that claims attention is the Bronze Tablet of Dali, now in the De Luynes collection in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris. The following list gives each case of the article's occurrence, with the number of the line in which it occurs. Two or three of the cases given may be classed rather as under the head of relative pronoun than as article; but they are retained because one of them is on the border line, and the others barely step over it; and even so the form is that of the Greek article, and not of the relative $\delta\varsigma$. The pronoun $\delta\delta\epsilon$ occurs several times in the inscription, but it is not convenient to notice it in connection with the article, as it requires an additional explanation of the principles of the writing. The following is the list:

Line] I. Occurrence of the Definite Article in the Bronze Tablet.

- (1.) *ta.* A.s.f., agreeing with *πολυν*. Final *n* not written.
to. i. D.s.n., agreeing with *τετει*, after preposition *i[v]*. *ι* adscript written.
to. G.s.m., agreeing with proper name. Its noun is the next word, and begins with *Ο*. No elision.
- (2.) *a.* N.s.f., agreeing with *πολυς*.
to. no. A.s.m., agreeing with proper name. The *ο* of the final *no*. begins the next word, the proper name aforesaid.
- (3.) *to. ni.* A.s.m., agreeing with *ιατηραν*, which immediately follows, and whose initial *i* is the vowel part of the *ni*.
to. se. A.p.m., agreeing with *κασιγνητος*. (-*τος* is preferred to -*ως*.)
 Final consonant regularly the *se*. character.
to. se. A.p.m., agreeing with *i[v]θρωπος*.
to. se. A.p.m., with participle after preceding noun.
ta. i. D.s.f., agreeing with *μαχαι*, after preposition *i[v]*. *ι* adscript written.
- (4.) *a.* N.s.f., agreeing with *πολυς*.
- (5.) *to. i. se.* D.p.m., agreeing with indirect object *κασιγνητους*.
to. G.s.m., agreeing with *μισθων*, after prep. *i[v]τι*.
ta. G.s.f.; probably for *ta. se.*, analogous to *ka.* for *ka. se.* Agrees with *iχθρων*.
to. i. D.s.m., agreeing with *λοικωι* after preposition *εξ*.
- (6.) *to. i.* D.s.m., in adjective phrase belonging to last noun.
ta. i. D.s.f., agreeing with *πολυι*, after prep. *εξ*.
to. G.s.m., agreeing with *αργυρων*, after prep. *i[v]τι*.
- (7.) *to.* G.p.n., agreeing with partitive gen. *ταλα[v]των*. It immediately precedes its noun (which commences with a dental mute), and final *n* or *ne*. is suppressed.
a. N.s.f., agreeing with *πολυς*.
to. i. se. D.p.m., same as 1.(5.).
- (8.) *ta. i.* D.f.s., agreeing with *ζαι* (= *γη*), after *απυ* (= *απο*). *ι* adscript written.
ta. i. Same as last, in adj. phrase following *ζαι*.
ta. i. Same as last.
to. i. D.s.m.(?), agreeing with *ρωνι* (new word) after participle of nearness.
to. i. Same as last, in adj. phrase after *ρωνι*.
to. A.s.m., agreeing with and immediately preceding *χωρον*. Final *n* or *ne*. suppressed.
- (9.) *to. ni.* A.s.m., in adj. phrase after *χωρον* above. The *i* of the last syllable is the preposition *i[v]*.
to. i. D.s.n., agreeing with *ελει*, after the preceding preposition *i[v]*, just mentioned.
to. A.s.m. in adj. phrase limiting *χωρον* above. It precedes a palatal mute, and the *n* or *ne*. is suppressed.
ta. A.p.n., agreeing with *τερχυνια* (new word).
ta. A.p.n., following the last mentioned noun in adj. phrase.

- (10.) *to. se.* A.p.m., agreeing with *κασιγνητος*.
- (11.) *to. se.* A.p.m., agreeing with *παιδας*.
to. G.p.m., agreeing with and immediately preceding *παιδων*. The final *n* or *ne* is suppressed.
to. no. G.p.m., agreeing with proper noun, of which the *o* in this syllable *no.* is the beginning.
to. i. D.s.m., agreeing with *χωρωι*, after prep. *ἐξ*.
- (12.) *o.* N.s.m., subject of a verb, and used like a relative pronoun.
to. i. se. D.p.m., agreeing with *κασιγνητοις*.
- (13.) *to. i. se.* D.p.m., agreeing with *παισι*.
to. na. A.s.m., agreeing with *ἀργυρον*, of which the *a* in *na.* forms the first letter.
- (14.) *to.* G.p.m., agreeing with and immediately preceding *κασιγνητων*. The final *n* or *ne* is suppressed.
to. na. G.p.m., following the last noun in adj. phrase. The *a* in *na.* forms first letter of next word.
- (15.) *a.* N.s.f., agreeing with *πολις*.
ta. G.s.f., same as in l. (5.).
to. G.s.m., same as in l. (5.).
- (16.) *a.* N.s.f., agreeing with *πολις*.
- (17.) *to.* G.s.m., agreeing with *ἀργυρω*.
ta. i. D.s.f., after *ἀπν*, agreeing with *ζαι*.
ta. i. D.s.f., in adj. phrase following last.
ta. i. D.s.f., in adj. phrase following last.
- (18.) *ta. i.* D.s.f., agreeing with *πεδμαι*, after prep. *ι[v]*.
to. A.s.m., agreeing with *χωρον* and immediately preceding it. The *n* or *ne* is suppressed.
to. A.s.m., in adj. phrase following last. Precedes a palatal mute, and *n* or *ne* is suppressed.
ta. A.p.n., same as in l. (9.) first time.
- (19.) *ta.* A.p.n., same as in l. (9.) second time.
to. A.s.m., in adj. phrase following *χωρον*. It immediately precedes a labial mute, and the *n* or *ne* is suppressed.
to. Probably G.s.m., agreeing with proper name; but it may be A.s.m. with final *n* or *ne* suppressed, before a dental. In that case it would agree with *χωρον* in adj. phrase following.
- (20.) *ta. ni.* A.s.f., agreeing with *ιερευαν*, after prep. *πος*. The *i* in *ni.* forms first letter of this noun.
ta. se. G.s.f., agreeing with *Ἀθανας*.
to. A.s.m., agreeing with and immediately preceding *καπον*. The *n* or *ne* is suppressed.
to. ni. A.s.m., in adj. phrase following *καπον* above. The *i* in *ni.* is the prep. *ι[v]*.
- (21.) *to.* A.s.m., used as relative pronoun, with *καπον* as antecedent. It precedes a dental, and the *n* is suppressed.
o. N.s.m., agreeing with a proper name or patronymic.
to. A.s.m., in adj. phrase following *καπον* understood; but may also be construed as a relative pronoun. It precedes a dental, and *n* is suppressed.

- (22.) *to. no.* A.s.m., agreeing with *νιον* understood. The *o* in *no.* is the first letter of next word.
ta. A.p.n. Same as l. (5.) first time.
ta. A.p.n. Same as l. (5.) second time.
- (23.) *to. se.* A.p.m., agreeing with *παῖδας*.
to. se. A.p.m., in adj. phrase following the last.
- (24.) *ta. i.* D.s.f., agreeing with *ζαι*, after prep. *ἐξ*.
to. i. D.s.m., agreeing with *καπῶι*, after prep. *ἐξ*.
- (25.) *o.* N.s.m., used as pronoun, relative, subject of verb.
to. i. se. D.p.m., agreeing with indirect object *παισι*.
to. na. A.s.m., agreeing with *ἀργυρον*, of which the *a* in *na.* forms the first letter.
- (26.) *ta.* Probably G.p.f., agreeing with, and immediately preceding *δαλτων* (= *δελτων*); and the *n* suppressed. Another, less probable, opinion makes it A. p. n., agreeing with *ἑπια*.
ta. A.p.n., agreeing with *ἑπια*.
- (27.) *a.* N.s.f., agreeing with *πολεις*.
ta. A.s.f., agreeing with and immediately preceding *θιον* (= *θεον* or *θειαν*) after prep. *ι[ν]*. The *n* is suppressed.
ta. na. A.s.f., agreeing with *Ἀθαναν*, in apposition with *θιον* just above. The *a* in *na.* is the first letter of *Ἀθαναν*.
ta. ne. A.s.f., in adj. phrase after the last. It is written in full. The next word commences with a labial, but is a preposition.
- (28.) *ta. se.* A.p.f. agreeing with *ῥητας* (= *ρητας*).
- (29.) *ta. se.* A.p.f., agreeing with *ῥητας*.
ta. sa. ke. A.p.f., agreeing with *ζας* (= *γας*) The words here are *τάς γε*; and the character *sa.* is regular. If it were *ta. se. ke.* the reading would be *τασεκ* or *τάς ἐκ*, or *τάς γέ*.
- (30.) *to. se.* A.p.m., agreeing with *καπος*.
o. i. N.p.m., agreeing with *παιδες*.
to. G.p.m., agreeing with and immediately preceding *παιδων*. The *n* is suppressed.
o. i. N.p.m., agreeing with *παιδες*.
- (31.) *o. i.* N.p.m., used as relative pronoun, subject of a verb.
to. i. D.s.m., agreeing with *ῥωνι*, dat. of place in which.
to. i. D.s.m., in adj. phrase following the last.

Including the few cases where the article passes, or seems to pass, into the relative pronoun, this inscription presents upwards of ninety occurrences of the article. To make clear the cases of its occurrence as a relative, the following example (l. 25) will serve: it reads *ὁ ἐξορυξε πεισει*; which Ahrens renders into "the common" by "*ὁς (ἄν) ἐξώσῃ τίσει*." Here, if the *ο* were an article simply, we should have a participle (*e.g.*, *ἐξορυξας*) in place of *ἐξορυξε*. But neglecting the pronominal

use, as well as other doubtful cases, we may sum up as follows:

The N.s.m. occurs uniformly in this inscription as *o.*, which may be represented by the ordinary Greek *ó*. As a relative it is perhaps to be transliterated as *ŏ*.

The N.s.f. is uniformly *a.*; the Greek *á*.

The N.s.n. appears not to occur in this inscription.

The G.s.m. is uniformly *to.*; the Greek *τῶ*.

The G.s.f. occurs once as *ta.se.*, that is, *τᾱς*; and twice as *ta.*, each time with a noun of the second declension fem. in *-ων*, and immediately preceding *í*. It is probable that this is a shortened form for *ta. se.*, or *τᾱς*. Analogous is the occasional contraction of *ka. se.* (*κας*, = *και*) into *ka*. The G.s.f. is therefore *τᾱς* or *τᾱ[ς]*.

The G.s.n. appears not to occur in the inscription.

The D.s.m. occurs often, and uniformly as *to.í.*; that is, *τοῖ*, (*τωῖ*), or *τῶ*. In other inscriptions the *í* is often omitted, according to the general practice of writing. But the omission is demonstrably only in the writing, and is not a variation of the form.

The D.s.f., also occurs often, and uniformly as *ta.í.*; that is, *ταῖ* or *τᾱ́*. This also, in other inscriptions, sometimes omits the *í*.

The D.s.n. occurs just once. It is exactly like the masc., *to.í.*; that is, *τοῖ*, (*τωῖ*), or *τῶ*.

The A.s.m. occurs many times. It occurs as *to.na.*, *to.no.*, *to.ní.*, and *to*. In the first three cases the vowel portion of the second syllable is the beginning of the next word, which is commonly (but not always) the word to which the article belongs. In the last case, the *n* is suppressed; but in each occurrence the following word commences with a mute. Five instances of this occur before a palatal, one before a dental, and two before a labial. Generally, too, the succeeding word is that to which the article belongs. The form is therefore clearly *τόν* or *τῶ[ν]*; but whether the *n* was sounded or not in cases where it is suppressed, is a question that cannot be discussed here.

The A.s.f. occurs a few times; once as *ta.ne.*, once as *ta.ní.*, once as *ta.na.*, and twice as *ta*. The first is the full form, and

is to be transliterated as *τάν*. In the next two cases, the vowel of the second syllable commences the next word; and in the last the *n* is suppressed; once before a labial mute commencing the next word, and once before a dental. Its form is therefore *τάν*, or *τάν[ν]*.

The A.s.n. appears not to occur in this inscription.

The N.p.m. occurs a few times; though in one case it fills the office of a relative pronoun. It is uniformly *ο.ί.*, that is, *οι*; and in the last case, perhaps *οί*.

The N.p.f. and n. do not appear to occur in the inscription.

The G.p.m. occurs a few times. It occurs as *to.no.*, *to.na.*, and *to*. In the first two cases the last vowel commences the next word; in the last case the *n* is suppressed, the next word commencing with a labial or palatal mute, and being the noun to which the article belongs.

The G.p.f. occurs once (l. 26.), as *ta*. The *n* is suppressed before a dental mute which commences the following word. The form is therefore *τάν[ν]* or *τάν*. This case has also another less probable solution. The one here adopted seems to be the only one which avoids all the difficulties.

The G.p.n. appears not to occur in the inscription.

The D.p.m. occurs several times; always as *to.ί.se.*, or *τῶς*. In each case the word following commences with a mute. There seems to be no reason why the last syllable should not be *sa.*, *so.*, *si.*, or *su.*, when the following word should commence with the appropriate vowel; though the analogy of the A.p.m. points differently.

The D.p.f. and n. do not appear to occur in the inscription.

The A.p.m. occurs several times, and always as *to.se.*; that is, *τῶς* (or *τῷς*). In one of these cases the following word commences with the vowel *a*.

The A.p.f. occurs twice; once as *ta.se.*, the next word commencing with a digamma, or *w* syllable; and the other time as *ta.sa.ke.*, the last syllable being the enclitic *γε*. By the rules of combination, *sa.* here is regular; but it shows that the two words were looked upon as one, at least for purposes of pronunciation. The form is therefore *τῷς*; while *ta.sa.ke.* is *τῷςγε* or *τῷς γε*; but the *γε* could not have had

accent as a separate word. The combination *ta.se.ke*. would have been *τὰς ἐκ* or *τασεκ*; or *τὰς γέ* or *τὰς ἔκ*, if either is conceivable.

The A.p.n. occurs several times, and always as *ta.*; that is, *τά*. Twice the next word begins with an *e* vowel, once with the digamma, and in other cases with a mute. In other inscriptions there is a plain elision; and then the *a* coalesces with the initial *a* of the next word; but no such case occurs in this inscription.

From the Bronze Tablet, therefore, the declension can be made out as follows:

SINGULAR.			PLURAL.		
Masc.	Fem.	Neut.	Masc.	Fem.	Neut.
N. <i>ὁ</i>	<i>ἡ</i>	—	<i>οἱ</i>	—	—
G. <i>τῶ</i>	<i>ταῖς</i> , <i>τᾷ[ς]</i>	—	<i>τῶν</i>	<i>ταῖ[v]</i>	—
D. <i>τοῖ(τῶ)</i>	<i>ταῖ</i> , <i>τᾷ</i>	<i>τοῖ(τῶ)</i>	<i>τοῖς</i>	—	—
A. <i>τόν</i>	<i>τάν</i>	—	<i>τός</i> , <i>τῶς</i>	<i>τάς</i>	<i>τά</i> .

Enough appears to show the coincidence throughout with the Doric; and it would be easy to fill the blanks from analogy. But some of the gaps can be filled from the other inscriptions, to which we will now proceed.

II. *The Bilingual Tablet of Dali.*

This tablet is now in the British Museum. It is a fragment of a marble pedestal upon which was doubtless once a statue to Apollo Amyclaeon, the Phoenician Resheph Mikal. The Cypriote portion consists of four lines. The article occurs as follows:

- (1.) Not once; but the line is fragmentary.
- (2.) *to*. G.p.f. Its word, immediately following, and a partitive genitive, commences with a labial mute; and the *n* is suppressed.
to.na. A.s.m., agreeing with and immediately preceding ἀνδρῶν[v]ταν.
 whose initial vowel is that of the *na*.
o. N.s.m., just preceding and agreeing with ἵαναξ.
- (3.) *a*. N.s.m., agreeing with and preceding a proper name which commences with 'A.
to. D.s.m., agreeing with proper name. *ι* adscript is omitted, but the case is marked by the termination of its noun.
ta.se. A.p.f., agreeing with and immediately preceding εὐχολας.
 The *e* in the *se*. does not form part of the next word.
- (4.) The article does not occur in this line.

This inscription entirely confirms the results of the first, and adds two things. (1.) It gives $\tau\tilde{\omega}\nu$ as an additional form for the G.p.f.; and (2.) it gives an instance of the D.s.m. written simply as $\tau\tilde{\omega}$, without the ι adscript. It hints that this last had disappeared in pronunciation. In the A.p.f., moreover, it shows that it could be written in full without the vowel sound of the final *se*. affecting at all the writing of the next word; and as far as it teaches anything, seems to show that this syllable, when final, was disregarded as to its vowel element. Analogous is silent final *e* in English and French.

III. The next inscription is the longest one in the Cesnola collection. Though not completely unriddled, its teaching as to the article is clear. It contains it only once (in l. 4), in the neut. pl., probably acc., and is written *ta*. The next word, not its noun, but yet presenting a case where elision would be allowable in Greek, begins with *a*., and yet is written separately. It may turn out that this *ta*., or $\tau\acute{a}$, is N.p.n.

IV. In the first Cesnola collection (old number, 256) is another inscription, never yet correctly published, consisting of a fragment of two lines. In l. (2.) occurs *ta*., A.s.f., with *n* suppressed, before its noun which commences with a digamma. This gives us $\tau\acute{a}[\nu]$. This inscription seems to hint that the *n* was suppressed in the writing, and not in the pronunciation; for the pronoun $\tau\acute{a}[\nu]\delta\epsilon$ and the adj. $\nu\epsilon\alpha[\nu]$ follow in the same construction, both with *n* suppressed.

V. The inscription on a bronze votive implement in the DeLuynes collection in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris contains the article twice in its first line, both D.s.f. The first agrees with a proper name, and the other is in an adj. phrase following the same. The first is written *ta*., and the second *ta.i*. This seems to leave it indifferent whether the D.s.f. should be written with or without ι adscript. In the first case the article precedes a word which should begin with *a*, but which a probable false stroke of the engraver has made to read *e*. The second immediately precedes an initial *e*.

VI. The inscription on a bronze votive spoon in the British Museum has the article twice; both in D.s.f., and both written *ta.i.*; that is *ταῖ* or *τῃ*. The reading that includes them is this: *ἰ[ν] ταῖ θιοῖ ταῖ Γολγυαῖ*.

VII. One doubtful case occurs on an inscription of three lines in the Cesnola collection; where the article apparently occurs twice in l. (1.) as *to*. Whether nom. or acc. neut. sing., or gen. sing. masc. or neut., or gen. pl. masc. or neut., is not yet clear. This is No. 29, Pl. vii, in my article, Jour. Am. Or. Soc., x. 201 ff.

VIII. In an inscription from Soloi, published by De Vogué (*Mélanges*, Pl. iv), now in the Louvre at Paris, the article occurs in l. (1.) in the N.s.m., as *o*, immediately before its noun, which commences with the digamma.

IX. On a British Museum inscription of two lines, recording a votive offering to Apollo Hylates, the article occurs three times in the first line; *to.i.*, and *to.*, both in D.s.m.; the first preceding and agreeing with *θεοῖ* or *θεωῖ*, the second following in an adj. phrase. The third occurrence is N.s.m., with a proper name following. It is written as *o*. The inscription is published by Deecke and Siegmund as their No. 7.

X. In another Cesnola inscription (Jour. Am. Or. Soc., x. 201 ff., No. 9 Pl. ii), the article occurs once in line (1.) and once in l. (2.), both D.s.m.; the first is written *to.i.*, and the other *to*. The one precedes and the other follows the dative *θεω*, which latter is written without a adscript.

XI. Another of the same (*supra*, No. 24 Pl. vi), contains the article in l. (1.) in D.s.m., as *to.i.* In the next line is a doubtful *ta*. for the same case; which may be a stone-cutter's mistake for *to*. However, it may not be the article at all; or there may be an elision.

XII. In another of same (*supra*, No. 23, Pl. vi), in l. (3.), occurs the D.s.m. written simply as *to.*; its noun immediately following being marked as dat. by termination.

XIII. Another of same (*supra*, No. 31, Pl. viii) contains the article and a Cypriote enclitic written *ta.sa. pa.i.*; that is, *τὰς παί*. Here *sa.* is regular, to mark the union of the two words, or their close connection. The article seems here to have the force of a relative pronoun.

XIV. An inscription of four lines found at Pyla, still, so far as I know, in Cyprus in possession of D. Pierides, contains in the third line the article in the D.s.m., written simply as *to.* The mutilation of the stone cuts off the termination of its noun; but there is every reason to believe that it was marked as dative by its termination.

XV.-XXII. Eight inscriptions found at Kythrea by Gen. di Cesnola just before leaving Cyprus for the last time. These are not yet adequately published; though the chief one is figured in my article in Scribner's Monthly for June, 1880. That contains all that occurs in the others, so far as the article is concerned, and more besides. The others are mere repetitions. In this the article occurs as follows:

- (1.) *ta.se.* G.s.f., agreeing with and just preceding Παφίας.
to. G.s.m., immediately preceding its noun, which commences with *i.*
 - (2.) *ta.i.* D.s.f., agreeing with and just preceding Παφίαι.
 - (3.) *ta.i.* D.s.f., agreeing with and just preceding Ἀφροδίται.
-

XXIII. A bilingual or digraphic inscription, in possession of D. Pierides, in Larnaka, Cyprus, contains two Cypriote lines, in which the article occurs as follows:

- (1.) N.s.m., written as *o.*, before and belonging to noun beginning with *so.*
N.s.m., written as *o.*, before and belonging to noun beginning with *pa.(ba.).*
- (2.) D.s.f., written *ta.*, before and belonging to a proper name beginning with *a.*

XXIV. Inscription De Vogué, *Mélanges*, Pl. iii, 2, a, contains in the second line the article in G.s.f., written *ta.se.*, before its noun commencing with the digamma. In the third line occurs the G.s.m., written *to.*, before its noun commencing with *i*.

XXV. De Vogué, *Mélanges*, Pl. iii, 2, b, c, contains the article in G.s.f., written as *ta.*, before its noun commencing with the digamma. It is another case of the contraction for *ta.se.*

XXVI. De Vogué, *Mélanges*, Pl. iv, 5, has in first line the N.s.m., written as *o.* before its noun commencing with *i*. In the second line occurs the G.s.f. written *ta.se.*, before its noun commencing with the digamma.

XXVII. XXVIII. These two inscriptions, intended as duplicates, at Alonia tou Episcopou, near New Paphos, on the artificial grotto dedicated to Apollo Hylates, though obscure and fragmentary, are very interesting. One is outside, over the outer doorway; the other is within, by the side of the inner doorway leading to the second apartment. The first is written in four lines, the second in two. Taking the first to represent both, its first line contains *o.*, N.s.m., preceding its noun, which is a proper name commencing with *a*. The second line contains *to.*, A.s.n., preceding its noun which commences with *se.pe.* (= $\sigma\pi\epsilon$). The second inscription repeats the N.s.m. *o.* in an adj. phrase following the noun; at a place where the first inscription is mutilated. These two inscriptions give the first clear example thus far of the A.s.n.; which is $\tau\acute{o}$.

XXIX. To these add the inscriptions of the gold armlets of King Ethevander found at Curium, and now in the Metropolitan Museum of Art with the other Cesnola collections, where the G.s.m. occurs in each as *to.*, before a proper name commencing with a labial; and we have before us all the inscriptions which at present are worth the trouble of searching for this special purpose. Some cases, as well as sundry other

inscriptions, are omitted ; because, though interesting, they are more or less doubtful. Moreover, I have mentioned none of which I have not seen and studied the original inscription itself.

The whole number here considered amounts to twenty-eight ; or in number (excluding coins), about one-seventh of the whole ; though in quantity of material, much more than six-sevenths of all the Cypriote writing known. In most of the inscriptions the article does not occur at all ; while the predominance of the dat. sing., masc. and fem., is explained by the fact that most of the inscriptions are votive, and give the article along with the proper or attributive name of the divinity to whom the offering is made.

It will be observed that for this particular discussion, as well as for the general subject of the writing, the Bronze Tablet furnishes far more material than all the other sources united. After the declension of the definite article has been deduced from that, the rest do little more than confirm inferences therefrom which are so inevitable that suspicion would attach to anything contradictory. The gaps actually filled by other inscriptions thus far appear to be nothing more than the A.s.n., and a G.p.f. in $\tau\omega\nu$. The material which *may* fill other gaps is not yet demonstrated to do so. The shorter inscriptions add more to show the principles of the writing, especially of the combination of the characters in particular cases, than to fill out the declension table.

The following is the declension of the article as thus far shown to occur in the inscriptions :

SINGULAR.			PLURAL.		
Masc.	Fem.	Neut.	Masc.	Fem.	Neut.
N. \acute{o}	\acute{a}	—	$\acute{o}\acute{i}$	$\acute{a}\acute{i}$	—
G. $\tau\acute{\omega}$	$\tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$, $\tau\acute{\alpha}[\varsigma]$	—	$\tau\acute{\omega}\nu$	$\tau\acute{\alpha}[\nu]$, $\tau\acute{\omega}\nu$	—
D. $\tau\acute{o}\acute{i}$ ($\tau\acute{\omega}$)	$\tau\acute{\alpha}\acute{i}$ ($\tau\acute{\alpha}$)	$\tau\acute{o}\acute{i}$ ($\tau\acute{\omega}$)	$\tau\acute{o}\acute{i}\varsigma$	—	—
A. $\tau\acute{o}\nu$	$\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu$	$\tau\acute{o}$	$\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ ($\tau\acute{\omega}\varsigma$)	$\tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$	$\tau\acute{\alpha}$.

The cases which do not actually occur (though some really may, unrecognized or undemonstrated) are the nom. and gen. sing. neut., the dat. fem. pl., and the nom., gen., and dat. pl. neut. As the acc. neut., sing. and pl., can scarcely fail to be the same with the nom. ; and as the gen. and dat. neut. can

scarcely fail to be the same with the corresponding cases of the masc., there remains only the dat. pl. fem. to fill in from analogy outside of that furnished by the writing itself. But of that no one can feel a doubt. The declension, so far as made out from undoubted, existing examples, coincides exactly with that exhibited in the Doric dialect.

V.—*Observations on Lucian.*

By JULIUS SACHS, PH.D.,

NEW YORK CITY.

The new avenue of philological communication which the initial numbers of the *Philological Journal* have opened seems to me to react in more than one way upon the character of these our annual meetings; since they have ceased to be our *only* means of presenting the results of our individual inquiries, they will probably assimilate themselves more and more to the model of the German Philological meetings. In addition to the final maturity of linguistic research that may challenge the world's criticism, the scholars of Germany very frequently test in these gatherings the strength and coherency of their private speculations; in this, the common workshop as it were, the crucial test is most readily applied to each new hypothesis, and under the investigation of unbiased critical minds the stability of arguments is best confirmed or else opportunely questioned. Starting from these premises I venture to propose some thoughts, elicited by a study of several of Lucian's writings. From a general conception of the literary, social, and moral atmosphere of Athens and Rome in the 2d century p. Ch. it is necessary to gather that experience of the temper of our author, which may serve as the common background of his artistic labors. So much had been effected by the older commentators and writers of the literary history of this period; but then the elusive quality of Lucian's mood, the subtle play between wit and seriousness, make it doubtful at the end of